

Serial No.: 09/858,387

7

PD-201006A

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated April 20, 2007, Claims 1 and 3-22 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1 and 3-22.

Applicants also wish to thank the Examiner for considering the information disclosure statement filed on January 30, 2007.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-12, 14 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross (U.S. Pat. No. 6,556,809) in view of Murray (U.S. Patent No. 5,666,128). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a base station having an adaptive antenna with a plurality of panels. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the plurality of panels are arranged to have substantially different fields of view.

The Examiner points to the Murray reference (column 4, lines 39-40) for a plurality of panels of an adaptive antenna. While more than one panel is illustrated, it appears that the fields of view of the panels are the same. Claim 1 and the other independent claims have been amended to clarify that the adaptive antenna has a plurality of panels that are arranged to have substantially different fields of view. As can be seen in Figure 2A of the present application, each of the panels has a substantially different field of view. Some overlap may occur on the edges so that continuous tracking of the mobile terminals may be performed.

Serial No.: 09/858,387

8

PD-201006A

Claims 3-12, 14 and 20-22 are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Murray as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kasperkovitz (U.S. Patent No. 4,631,499). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 depends from claim 1 and is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Murray as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Agee (U.S. Pub. 20060128276A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 15-17 and 19 each depend from claim 1. The Agee reference also does not teach or suggest the elements missing from claim 1 described above. Therefore, applicants believe that these claims are believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Murray as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Janc (U.S. Patent No. 4,893,316) and further in view of Sayegh (U.S. Pub. 20060084541A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 depends from claim 1. The Sayegh reference also does not teach or suggest the elements missing in the Gross and Murray references described above. Therefore, claim 18 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Serial No.: 09/858,387

9

PD-201006A


CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and remarks above, Applicants submit that all rejections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments which would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Should any fees be associated with this submission, the Commissioner is authorized to charge applicant's Deposit Account 50-0383.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 10, 2007

By: 
Georgann S. Grunebach, Reg. No. 33,179
Attorney for Applicants

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.
CA / LA1 / A109
2230 East Imperial Highway
P.O. Box 956
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956

Telephone: (310) 964-4615